

LB 2350  
'H6

# ARTICULATION OF HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE

---

REORGANIZATION  
OF SECONDARY EDUCATION



ARTICULATION OF  
HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE  
THE REORGANIZATION OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

STATEMENT  
OF THE HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS ASSOCIATION  
OF NEW YORK CITY

OPINIONS  
FROM COLLEGE PRESIDENTS, SUPERINTENDENTS,  
AND HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

RESOLUTIONS  
ADOPTED BY THREE DEPARTMENTS OF THE  
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

HIGH SCHOOL  
TEACHERS ASSOCIATION  
NEW YORK CITY  
NOVEMBER, 1910

LB 2350  
.H6

Assoc.

APR - 1911

# INTRODUCTION

---

The conviction is spreading throughout the United States that our high schools are seriously handicapped by present college entrance requirements. In the west, the colleges and high schools are co-operating with marked success in bringing about a better articulation of these two institutions. In order to hasten a reform in the east the High School Teachers Association of New York City at its meeting in March, 1910, authorized the President of the Association, Mr. Arthur L. Janes, to appoint a committee of five to consider what steps should be taken. He appointed the following committee:—William McAndrew, Principal of the Washington Irving High School; Ellen R. Rushmore, of the Manual Training High School; James Sullivan, Principal of the Boys High School; James F. Wilson, of the Stuyvesant High School; and Clarence D. Kingsley, of the Manual Training High School, Chairman. This committee made a detailed study of the entrance requirements of a large number of colleges and drew up a statement setting forth the impossibility of wisely meeting the needs of our high school students on account of present college entrance requirements. The committee suggested two methods of improving the situation:

1. By the first method college entrance would be based upon the simple fact of graduation from a four-year course in a first-class high school. This method would give complete satisfaction to the high school. If supplemented by competent examination into the efficiency of each school, we believe this method would tend to develop within the high school that independence, breadth, and judgment required to produce the best results. The improvement in the high schools would result in better preparation and more students for the college.

2. The second method, not as radical as the first, was proposed, in order that the high schools might derive as soon as possible some measure of relief from present conditions.

This second method calls for:

- (a) the reduction in the number of so-called "required" subjects, together with

- (b) the recognition of all standard subjects, as electives.

The requirement of two foreign languages from every student is regarded as particularly objectionable.

The committee reported its conclusions at the annual meeting of the association May 7th, 1910. The association ratified its statement, which is given on pages 8 and 9 of this pamphlet, and instructed the com-

mittee to send it out and to invite correspondence upon the matters involved.

The committee wrote to the Presidents of one hundred and fifteen colleges, to each State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and to a number of City Superintendents and High School Principals. The replies in which opinions were expressed are given, practically complete, in this pamphlet, and arranged by states, the replies from the colleges being given first under each state. Two or three replies have been omitted because they were not for publication. All the replies in this pamphlet, with one exception, were received in May and June.

### ANALYSIS OF REPLIES.

We have received expressions of opinion from the presidents of the twenty-five following colleges and universities:—Adelphi, Brown, Buffalo, Case School, Chicago, Dickinson, Girard, Goucher (formerly Woman's College of Baltimore), Haverford, Illinois, Massachusetts Agricultural, Middlebury, Minnesota, Nebraska, Northwestern, Ohio, Pittsburgh, Purdue, Rochester, St. Johns, Stevens, Swarthmore, Trinity, Tufts, and Williams.

Of the presidents of these twenty-five colleges and universities, three state that they are not in favor of the change from two to one foreign language. Nearly all of the other presidents endorse some or all of the recommendations indicated in our statement. Several college presidents write that they will recommend forthwith to their faculties modifications as suggested, and in several cases the presidents are in favor of our first proposition, namely admitting students upon graduation from standard high schools. In some cases, the presidents write that they have already reduced the number of required subjects and have recognized a wide range of subjects as electives.

Dr. Charles W. Eliot, President Emeritus of Harvard University, is one of the few who take a different view of the situation. He disapproves of the accrediting system. He disapproves of admitting students with only one foreign language. He sanctions a wide range of subjects as electives but his reply seems to indicate a belief that a wide differentiation of high schools may accomplish the ends of a wise reorganization of secondary education. This, however, as a substitute for a revision of entrance requirements would assume that the students in commercial and other modern courses would continue to have the present difficulties in preparing for a regular college.

From the following eight colleges and universities we have received replies from professors to whom our statement was referred: Cornell, Columbia, Johns Hopkins, Ohio State, Ohio Wesleyan, Pennsylvania, Union, and the University of Washington.

We have received replies from the State Superintendents of Public Instruction in the following states: Massachusetts, Vermont, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico; from State Superintendent Joyner of North Carolina, President last year of the National Education Association; from Deputy Superintendent Tietrick of Pennsylvania; and from State High School Inspector Hayward, who writes for the State Superintendent of North Dakota. It is significant that every one of these superintendents, without exception, agrees wholly, or in the main, with our recommendations. State Superintendent Draper of New York writes, "I think that the colleges should receive the graduates of recognized high schools and give them their opportunity to show whether or not they can do college work." State Superintendent Snedden of Massachusetts writes, "The present situation is most objectionable, and especially in the restrictive effects it is having on true high school development." State Superintendent Stone of Vermont sets forth the function of the high school thus: "The chief function of the high school is to enable the individual to find out what he can best do and to give him a certain degree of culture and discipline. If the individual is required to fit the school and the school does not fit the individual, the individual becomes crippled, and we are having too many deformities as a result of our restricted and required courses."

We have also received expressions of opinion from about twenty superintendents of schools in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Springfield, and other important school systems. These replies have been practically unanimous in endorsing the movement. The majority were emphatic in their approval.

## THE FUNCTIONS OF THE HIGH SCHOOL.

The articulation of high school and college should proceed upon a clear conception of the functions of the high school. These functions seem to be the three following:

- (1) To help the individual discover what he can best do in view of his own ability and the conditions in his community.

- (2) To give him a carefully planned course, adapted to his needs as rapidly as his bent is discovered.

- (3) To inspire him to continue his education further if circumstances warrant.

If this statement is sound, it follows that:

- (1) To perform the first function, our high school educators need to be able to help the student discover his bent and to know the various opportunities existing in the community.

- (2) The second function calls for many differentiated courses, and many prefer to have these courses side by side in the same school so that

the student may be encouraged and not hindered in selecting the course best for him, when he discovers himself.

(3) The third function calls for the broadening of the basis of college entrance, in order that we may have no unnecessary blind alleys in our high schools.

In addition to those four-year courses, which we hope the college will soon fully recognize, many communities need the establishment of two-year courses and trade courses planned without reference to college admission.

#### SALIENT POINTS IN THE DISCUSSION.

First. Frequent reference is made in the replies received to the fact that no one can foretell upon a student's entering high school whether or not he will finally go to college. We wish to emphasize this as the fundamental point in our whole discussion. If it were possible to foretell, the American high school should be censured for not performing its third function, that of inspiring students to a desire for higher education. The colleges themselves have long recognized the desirability of encouraging children from the humblest families in their endeavor to obtain a higher education. Any separation of students into college preparatory high schools and other high schools would be a distinct abandonment of that which American education has heretofore regarded as its greatest achievement. Such a system might be viewed with favor in a country dominated by class distinctions.

Second. We fear that the educational value of manual training and commercial subjects is not yet fully recognized. We do not agree with the idea that these subjects should be taken in the high school only by those whose college course is to contain a continuation of these subjects. On the contrary, if a student is going to a college where no opportunity is afforded for the education that comes through the hand, or where no courses are offered in commercial theory and practice, his need for some such work in the high school is all the greater. For instance, engineers often fail from lack of business sense, and physicians and surgeons need skill of hand.

Third. Our education would gain in power and in virility if we made more of the dominant interest that each boy and each girl has at the time. A high grade course in stenography and typewriting that appeals to the dominant interest of the boy or girl will afford excellent training in spelling, punctuation, and composition. This training becomes of value whatever college course may be built upon it.

The gain which would come to our colleges by the encouragement in the high school of courses that make their appeal to the live interests of real boys and girls is clearly brought out in the reply of Dean Davenport of the University of Illinois and in his valuable book, "Education for Efficiency."



Probably as many students fail in college from a lack of determination and aim, as from a lack in quantity of preparation along established lines, and consequently a reorganization of secondary education that will assist boys and girls to get a purpose in life before leaving the high school will help the college in many ways.

Fourth. While it may be true that the newer subjects for which we seek recognition in many cases are not as well taught as the older subjects, still we believe that the way to raise the standard is to hold out to the schools the incentive that these subjects will be accepted just as rapidly as the work comes up to a high standard in each particular school. In this way the school will be encouraged and not hindered, Boards of Education will more readily improve the equipment and employ capable teachers for these subjects, and the students will not be overcrowded in the attempt to carry the new subjects in addition to the full amount of the older subjects.

### CONCLUSION.

In view of the fact that the high school itself is confronted by new and difficult problems the solution of which is of the greatest importance to the community, it certainly seems not unreasonable that the High School should ask of the College all the co-operation possible in order that working together they may advance the best interests of the educational system for the benefit of all concerned.

Even though there may be fears that the results temporarily may in some cases be somewhat unsatisfactory judged from the older standards of set and finished results, yet in the interests of the enthusiasm which comes in meeting new conditions and from the satisfaction which arises in solving new problems, a quality for which the American people is distinguished, we issue this pamphlet in the hope that the College may make the modifications needed by the High School.

CLARENCE D. KINGSLEY, Chairman

WILLIAM McANDREW

ELLEN R. RUSHMORE

JAMES SULLIVAN

JAMES F. WILSON

Committee on Conference with the Colleges.

Address of the Chairman,  
400 Fourth Street,  
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Three sections of the National Education Association, at the annual meeting July 1910, passed resolutions upon the urgent need for the revision of college entrance requirements. These resolutions are given on the last pages of this pamphlet.

# STATEMENT

OF THE

## HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

ON THE

### ARTICULATION OF HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE

THE REORGANIZATION OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

We believe that the interests of the forty thousand boys and girls who annually attend the nineteen high schools of this city cannot be wisely and fully served under present college entrance requirements. Our experience seems to prove the existence of a wide discrepancy between "preparation for life" and "preparation for college" as defined by college entrance requirements.

So long as this discrepancy exists, both the child and society suffer, for the following two reasons:

First:—Every attempt to divide high school students into two classes and to prepare one class for college and the other class for life is unsatisfactory. Many of those being "prepared for college" drop out of school without proper education for citizenship and without the industrial or commercial efficiency which society rightly demands the tax-supported high school should develop. Those being "prepared for life" include many who, later in their course, would go to college if the work already done were recognized by the colleges.

Second:—The attempt to prepare the student for college under the present requirements and at the same time to teach him such other subjects as are needed for life is unsatisfactory. Under these conditions the student often has too much to do. The quality of all his work is likely to suffer. The additional subjects are slighted because they do not count for admission to college. In such a course it is impossible for the student to give these subjects as much time and energy as social conditions demand.

For these reasons we desire to call your attention to the entrance requirements of Clark College. This college accepts the graduates of any New England public high school or of any other high school with equivalent standard. They report that the results are satisfactory to the college. May we ask what, in your opinion, would be the objections, if any, to the acceptance by your college, of the graduates of the high schools of New York City? Such a definition of entrance requirements would secure to the college a four years' preparatory course and would enable the high school to perform its function as a tax-supported institution. Under the present method of defining entrance requirements, students who have not completed our courses of study repeatedly gain admission to college, often to the weakening of both college and high school.

If this departure seems too radical, may we call your attention to the following statements and recommend the modifications in present entrance requirements which seem to us most urgent? There are seven distinct lines of work which we believe essential to a well-rounded high school course; to wit, language, mathematics, history and civics, science, music, drawing, and manual training. Girls must be taught household science and art. Moreover, we believe that the twentieth century demands that the high schools should not cast all students in the same mold; that the amount of science and manual training which is sufficient for one student is utterly inadequate for another; and that a training for business may be given in the high school which will be as cultural and as respectable as any other course. To enable the high schools to adapt secondary education to the varying needs of different students in such a manner as to meet the diverse demands of the professions, of industry, and of commerce, progress seems to us to require

- (a) the reduction in the number of so-called "required" subjects, together with
- (b) the recognition of all standard subjects, as electives.

The specified entrance requirement of two foreign languages, the meager electives in science, and the absence of recognition for drawing, music, household science and art, shopwork, commercial branches, and civics and economics, constitute the chief difficulty.

We should like to see it possible for a student upon entering the high school to choose Latin or German or French; to confine his work in foreign language, during his high school course, to one such language in case the remainder of his time is required for other subjects; and to find at the end of his high school course that he has met the foreign language requirements of whatever college he may choose to enter. We should like to see no discrimination against Latin for the course leading to the B. S. degree, so that students choosing any language may enter the B. S. course.

We should like to see the following subjects recognized by college entrance credits:

Music, 1 unit; mechanical and freehand drawing, each  $\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 unit; joinery, pattern making, forging, machine shop practice, each  $\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 unit; household chemistry, botany, zoölogy, physiography, applied physics, and advanced chemistry, each 1 unit; modern history, 1 unit; civics and economics, each  $\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 unit; household science and art, 2 units; and commercial geography, commercial law, stenography and typewriting, elementary bookkeeping, advanced bookkeeping, and accounting, each  $\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 unit.

A recent study of entrance requirements shows that many colleges are already requiring only one foreign language for admission, and that many of the above subjects have received recognition.

# REPLIES

## ARRANGED BY STATES

---

### CONNECTICUT

**FLAVEL S. LUTHER, LL. D., President Trinity College.**

I have received your letter of May 18th with the accompanying circular. I fully appreciate your position. Please understand, however that, in what follows, I express only my personal opinions, with which I do not believe many college faculties would coincide.

I agree with you fully that the present situation is intolerable. I agree with almost everything in your circular except, perhaps, the assignment of numerical values to a specific list of subjects. It seems to me that what the colleges ought to want is this—some process whereby they may be assured that candidates entering college have reached such a stage of intellectual maturity and training that they are capable of undertaking college work, under college methods of teaching, with a fair prospect of success. In the old days Freshmen entering college went on with the studies which they had been pursuing in school, and the quantitative requirements were reasonable, perhaps inevitable. To-day the situation has been entirely changed. In Trinity College, for example, there is no subject taught, except Latin and Mathematics, which is not begun in college; that is to say, there are only these two subjects for which any specific training is necessary beyond Reading, Writing, and Arithmetic. Of course, it is proper to point out that Physics, Civil Engineering, and some other subjects, do require a further Mathematical preparation. Greek, French, Italian, Spanish, History, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Economics, Philosophy, etc., etc., are or may be begun in our institution.

Again, then, it appears that what we want is some reasonable confidence that our students may begin these studies and go on with them rapidly and successfully, of course with the understanding that they may pick up some of these subjects at such an advanced stage as their preparation may justify. I do not believe that it makes very much difference what boys and girls study in the high school so far as their college career is concerned, provided they study hard and secure sufficient intellectual development and training to enable them to do some kind of work appropriate to the college age and the college courses.

An ideal arrangement to my mind would be one whereby a very, very large list of high schools and preparatory schools should be prepared under competent authority, with the understanding that these schools might send their students to any college in the country simply upon

certificate of graduation. Among other advantages this plan would result in the saving of practically a year of each candidate's life, now devoted to preparation for formal and highly unsatisfactory examinations. I believe that we shall come to some such plan as this, sooner or later.

**CHARLES W. DEANE, Ph.D., City Superintendent, Bridgeport.**

I consider the ideas set forth in it sound, and would be glad to see them prevail.

**CHARLES B. JENNINGS, City Superintendent, New London.**

It is high time, it seems to me, that the colleges of the country abandoned their time-honored practice and custom of prescribing a certain cut and dried examination that all applicants must pass before entering college. Without any desire to criticize, I have felt for a number of years that the colleges have not responded as much as the lower schools to the modern trend of public opinion in regard to education. They will all come into line eventually, for they mean right. It is simply the inertia of long continued custom. I am heartily in favor of the plan, as outlined, which you send to me.

**B. W. TINKER, City Superintendent, Waterbury.**

For a long time I have felt that the colleges were making unnecessary restrictions in regard to "preparation." The number of required subjects is so great that if the work of preparation is not begun immediately upon entering high school, it is almost always necessary for the pupils to spend five years or more in such preparation. Too much attention is paid to the amount of matter covered, and too little to how it is covered. It ought to be a question of ability. I am heartily in sympathy with the work you are undertaking.

**EDWARD H. GUMBART, Ph.D., Principal, Norwalk High School,  
South Norwalk.**

I heartily agree with the sentiments expressed. Please count me in to support any movement to carry out such a reorganization of secondary education as you have proposed.

**JOHN P. CUSHING, Head Master, New Haven High School,  
New Haven.**

Your articulation of high school and college is too liberal for me.

## ILLINOIS

**HARRY PRATT JUDSON, LL.D., President University of Chicago.**

I am much interested in your statement. It hardly needs referring to the faculty of the University of Chicago, as we have been for some time very nearly on the basis indicated. In my opinion a student who has gone through the four years' course in a high school of recognized good quality ought to be admitted to college, and the college curriculum ought to be adjusted so as to permit such student to find suitable work.

**ABRAM W. HARRIS, LL. D., President Northwestern University,  
Evanston.**

I was for eight years President of the University of Maine. I have now been for four years President of Northwestern University, and in between I was for five years principal of the Jacob Tome Institute, which contained a boys' boarding school of high school grade. My Tome experience gave me knowledge of the problem you are considering, and I sympathize fully with your purposes.

When at Maine I brought into use admission by certificate, which required, (1) graduation from a four-year high school, and (2) the satisfactory completion of certain specified studies that made up approximately one-third of the high school course, and (3) a definite recommendation of the principal that the candidate was, in his judgment, fitted for the course he was to undertake.

This system was intended to leave large liberty in developing the high school course to those who knew local conditions best, namely, the principals. It was intended to establish sympathetic and cordial relations with the principals. The plan was eminently successful, and under it the standard of scholarship constantly improved. Students who completed the required studies, but had not completed a high school course, were allowed to take examinations and were admitted if their ranks were thoroughly satisfactory. The number of such candidates was small, and only a small proportion passed, although occasionally a very good man was admitted whose preparation had been irregular.

Northwestern University has recently modified its admission requirements for the College of Liberal Arts, with the express intention of accomplishing the results you desire.

**EDMUND J. JAMES, LL.D., President University of Illinois.**

I do not suppose the University of Illinois would make any objection to accepting the graduates of the high schools of New York City for matriculation in the University. There are certain fundamental sub-

jects varying with the course chosen, which we have to require because the knowledge of these subjects is a technical requirement for success in the course. Otherwise I believe you will find the University of Illinois in full sympathy with the general proposition of your communication.

**H. A. HOLLISTER, High School Visitor, University of Illinois.**

President James, of the University, has just sent to me your letter of May 30th with a request that I undertake to reply. I have read with interest your circular on "Articulation of High School and College." It seems to me that the general position taken by your committee in regard to these matters is fully justified by the situation.

The University of Illinois has long exercised a liberal attitude in regard to electives. Foreign language work, for instance, has been prescribed only for the College of Literature and Arts, and even in this case no particular language has been prescribed for admission. A wide range of electives in science and history has characterized our attitude toward secondary schools. More recently we have broadened out still more by introducing in our list of electives for admission manual training, commercial work, domestic science, and agriculture. With the exception of work in manual training, we have had little experience, as yet, with these new subjects. We are just assigning credit to a limited group of high schools for the first time this spring. In the case of manual training work, the experience thus far has been very satisfactory. There seems to have been no indication of any depreciation in the quality of preparation offered by students who have taken advantage of this subject as an elective. We do not anticipate any difficulty with regard to other new subjects mentioned above.

One of the most serious difficulties we have, however, in adjusting credits with reference to these subjects is the comparative lack of uniformity in the nature and grade of work offered by the high school. These difficulties we are undertaking to overcome through a conference of high school teachers which meets annually here at the University. In these conferences we invite representative high school people to discuss with us standards and unit definitions with regard to all entrance subjects, and thus far we have found it possible to base our requirements on the definitions agreed to by these conferences. In this way we hope gradually to be able to establish these new subjects on a basis of equality as to subject matter, dealing in such a way as to make the accrediting of them as simple as that of the standard high school subjects.

In this connection, it may be of interest to call attention to the fact that in our experience in dealing with high schools, it seems much

more difficult to get teachers as well equipped for the teaching of these newer branches as those who teach the older academic subjects. One does not have to seek very far to find reasons for this. Very few institutions are really prepared to train teachers with adequate scholarship attainments for the teaching of the manual arts, domestic science, commercial subjects, or agriculture. If you happen to get hold of a recent publication by me entitled "High School Administration," D. C. Heath & Co., you will find in it a chapter dealing with the relation of the high school to colleges and universities, in which I have tried to explain the situation, especially with reference to the accrediting of subjects more modern and practical in character.

I think you will agree with me that it is quite desirable that we proceed with some deliberation in undertaking to standardize these subjects which are now calling for recognition. This need is probably not so much felt in New England and New York as it is in the Middle West where our growth is more recent and where our development is rapid. However this may be, I feel sure that the ultimate aim and purpose of our colleges and universities should be fully as broad as that indicated in your circular on the subject of "College Entrance."

**EUGENE DAVENPORT, Dean of College of Agriculture, University of Illinois.**

First, let me say that I am glad to give this opinion for what it is worth, though I do not pose as an educational expert. The little book, "Education for Efficiency," was an outpouring of my own experience in acting as a godfather to a new subject trying to blaze its way into good academic society. I would be the last to degrade the high standards of this society, but, on the other hand, I have contended strenuously that when a new member comes along, he ought to be admitted.

The point you raise, however, involves even a larger question in academic policy, and yet I find myself in thorough sympathy with the position taken by the teachers of the high schools. To me the high school is par excellence the educational center of the community in which the great bulk of the young people will receive all the training they will ever get for the life that they will pursue, and that very generally they will find their lives not far removed from the vicinity of the school. The matter you mention is fundamental in that it is impossible to determine at any time which individuals will ultimately go to college and which will not, and therefore the training of the two in this respect must be identical, all of which means that the colleges and universities must "hitch on" (a good agricultural phrase) to the high schools the best they may, or else the high schools will be distorted into nothing but preparatory schools for college to the



vast detriment of the mass of students who will never see the college for which they were supposedly prepared.

This University publishes a list of subjects which would be accepted for credit, and while it does not announce that it will accept for credit anything and everything that is taught in any school, yet it puts into this list every new subject that is offered in the high schools as soon as this subject is even reasonably well taught. For example, we now accept for admission in this University: Agriculture, one to two units; Business Law, one-half unit; Domestic Science, one unit; Manual Training, one to two units, etc. Foreign language is required for admission only in the College of Literature and Arts. However, foreign language is practically required for graduation in all the colleges. Certain substitutions may be made in the Colleges of Agriculture and Engineering, but at considerable additional labor on the part of the student.

This all means, I think, that we are perfectly ready to accept both information and training that come out of certain new subjects and accept them in full value for college entrance. I think our experience is that we do not get in some of these new subjects the same degree of academic training that can be brought with some of the older and better established studies like language and mathematics, but we do get, on the other hand, a lively interest, a directness and an inclination to engage in actual problems of life, which is far less assured with those subjects whose subject matter deals largely with the past and whose atmosphere is decidedly ancient. It is, you see, the deliberate purpose of this University to meet the high schools on their own ground. It is true some of the schools complain of University dominance, but that is rather in a quantitative than in a qualitative sense and arises from our attempt to deal with a large number of schools of a varying degree of efficiency. So far as subject matter is concerned, however, we are ready to accept anything which the schools do and do well.

Our experience is, so far as I am able to state it, that we gain in the matter of interest in life problems and ability to solve them far more than we lose in academic finish. There is no doubt that pure scholarship in the old sense of the term can best be developed with old and finished subjects. On the other hand, the modern American is to be made principally out of new subjects, finished off, so to speak, with the old ones. We try, therefore, to combine the two and keep as close as possible to the life and heart of the people.

All this is only saying in a round-about way that my interest is entirely with the high schools in their desire to so conduct their affairs as to serve the varied communities which support them, and it will remain there so long as they conscientiously do this work. When they abandon this high purpose and serve only as preparatory

schools for colleges, I shall lose my interest in them, believing that they have sacrificed their rights as they have their opportunities.

**PROFESSOR OTIS W. CALDWELL, University of Chicago.**

Your statement is fine and represents the attitude that is being taken by many of our progressive high schools in the Central States.

The High School has come to perform a function that makes it an autonomous body. It is now necessary for the High School to consider its own problems almost independently of the College and University. High Schools need to educate for general efficiency, and pupils who go to College need this kind of training *quite* as much as those who do not go. The lack of industrial and social perspective on the part of college graduates should be corrected by a High School education which deals with those *matters* that are of the *greatest value* to the *largest number*.

**PROFESSOR C. RIBORG MANN, University of Chicago.**

I am very much interested in this question and consider your statement the best that I have yet seen on the subject. There is a growing sentiment here at the University of Chicago in favor of the ideas which you present. The Federation of Secondary School Teachers, an association of which I am president, has a committee working on this same subject. There are about 2200 members of the associations in the Federation scattered all over the country.

**J. STANLEY BROWN, Superintendent and Principal, Joliet Township High School, Joliet.**

I congratulate your committee on the work done, and assure you that all movements looking to the complete autonomy of the public high school will be welcomed by the teaching bodies of the whole country.

**JAMES E. ARMSTRONG, Principal Englewood High School, Chicago.**

I think we have a decided advantage over your schools in the east in regard to college entrance requirements. I am in entire accord with the point mentioned in the circular on "Articulation of High School and College." I think you will recognize that we are a long stride ahead of the eastern schools in all these relations. We have an association of all the colleges, universities, and secondary schools in the North Central States. A committee of twenty or thirty people from these various institutions make a definition of each unit of the

college requirements for admission; and in this way the high school men have their say as to what subjects should be accepted by the colleges from the high school graduates.

## INDIANA

**WINTHROP E. STONE, Ph.D., President Purdue University, Lafayette.**

At Purdue we are entirely in sympathy with the recognition, as preparation for college, of a wide range of high school subjects and we are chiefly concerned that these subjects should be seriously and thoroughly taught in some properly arranged sequence and relation, believing that when the high school pupil has mastered them, he has in effect gained the necessary mental power and direction to enable him to do collegiate work.

Since, however, Purdue is a scientific and technological institution, we find it necessary to prescribe certain preparatory studies in order that our entering students shall be able to go on with our own courses. Of the fifteen units required for admission, ten are thus prescribed, namely, English, foreign language, mathematics, science, and history. The remaining five units which the applicant must submit may be made up of subjects chosen in the departments of English, foreign language, mathematics, science, history, shop work, drawing, domestic science, agriculture, and commercial courses in varying weights.

It is our endeavor in arranging these requirements to meet school conditions and to accomplish what is referred to in your circular; namely, the reduction of required subjects and the recognition of all standard subjects as electives.

**M. H. STUART, Assistant Principal Manual Training High School, Indianapolis.**

Your letter and circular regarding college entrance requirements which was mailed to Superintendent Kendall, has been forwarded to me for reply. Your circular is very interesting and bears directly on the vital high school difficulty. Your first suggestion—that the colleges admit all of the graduates from standard high schools—would, of course, be satisfactory to us and would enable the high school to meet the demands of the people. I fear, however, that the college people might consider this a little too radical, since the high schools are now developing such a varied course of study. So, from a practical point of view, I am inclined toward your second suggestion of reducing the number of required subjects and giving recognition to all of the standard lines of work represented in the modern city high school.

This, it seems to me, is perfectly feasible and in line with the future development of high school work. I would favor reducing the required subjects to English, mathematics, and one foreign language, including among the elective subjects, all those mentioned in your circular. In brief, I am very enthusiastic regarding your second plan for solving this much discussed difficulty. Any assistance that we may be able to give you in this line will be gladly contributed.

## MARYLAND

**EUGENE A. NOBLE, LL. D., President Goucher College, Baltimore.**

I am not in favor of having the colleges prescribe, and command, and rigidly determine, just what work the secondary schools must do. I have objected to that consistently. It is entirely unfair for any college to assume that its requirements must give character to all the work done in the secondary schools. This point is definite in my mind: That in some measure the secondary schools must break away from what the old colleges imposed upon them as necessary aspects of activity.

While I should not be willing to forecast the educational future, yet I am inclined to believe that what we shall have to do is this: To have a number of high schools that pay comparatively little attention to college preparation, and some other schools that devote themselves to that. I do not believe the colleges will admit students whose work has not been systematically arranged and conducted before they are admitted as Freshmen. This being so, I can see nothing for it but to have a number of schools devote themselves to college preparation.

What Clark College is trying to do, I suppose we are all trying to do, to determine in advance the ability of a student to do the work of a Freshman year, that is to admit the students "on trial." That in itself is not a bad plan. As far back as five years ago I urged such a plan upon one of the best New England colleges. I should not be averse to having it tried in this institution from schools that were on an approved list to receive students who have graduated and perhaps had made a grade of something higher than mere passing; then let their work for the first half year in college determine whether they were able to carry college tasks successfully. Perhaps you do not know that we have a list of alternative entrance requirements, a plan which was adopted in order that admission to our Freshmen class might adjust itself to the inequalities of preparation in different parts of the country. We have held that it is the business of the college to adjust its re-

quirements for admission in such a way that existing inequalities in different parts of the country shall be met. We believe that entirely too much deference has been paid to the rigid system originating in New England and we should be glad to see certain changes and modifications made in order to satisfy the educational requirements of the whole country.

So far as the work of this college is concerned, and the work as I imagine it of some other colleges, it would be absurd for us to accept handicraft, household sciences, bookkeeping, machine shop practice, pattern making, forging, stenography and typewriting, etc., for entrance. I could wish that both mechanical and freehand drawing were recognized, and if there were some way to determine the unit value of music, I should like to see music recognized. To determine the unit value of some of the subjects in your list seems to me to be nearly impossible. If all the high schools within our territory taught the same subject with the same sincerity of method, it would not be a difficult matter for the college to determine what it ought to receive for entrance.

**EDWARD H. GRIFFIN, Dean of the College Faculty, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.**

We fully appreciate the importance of this subject, and the difficulties of the problem which it presents. It is now too late in the year to invite an expression of opinion by our academic staff, but I shall be glad to bring the subject up for discussion next year.

I am personally in favor of accepting properly guarded certificates, from properly accredited high schools, for admission to college. I am also in favor of accommodating the entrance requirements, as far as possible, to the needs of the high school. But I do not see how "vocational subjects"—if I may use that term—can be substituted for the standard subjects, to any very considerable extent.

## MASSACHUSETTS

**CHARLES W. ELIOT, LL.D., President Emeritus Harvard University.**

I have read the statement regarding the articulation of high school and college which you were good enough to send me under date of June fourth. It discusses a very large question in public secondary education, and I am free to confess that my own mind is not clear as to the best interests of the public high school. In Boston and Cambridge, where there have long been free Latin schools supported by taxation, the solution of the problem has been very different from that which your statement suggests; and of late years an active differenti-

ation in high schools has been going on, so that we now have three well-marked types of high schools. On the other hand, Harvard College already counts for admission physics, chemistry, civil government, anatomy, zoölogy and economics, freehand and projection drawing, astronomy, harmony and counterpoint, various kinds of shop work, and English and American history. On the whole, this is a more comprehensive list than that which stands on the third page of your statement,—considering that Harvard College admits no girls.

The weak points of your statement seem to me to be the following: (1) You call attention to the entrance requirements of Clark College. These are the lowest and most enfeebling for secondary schools ever made in New England. (2) You approve the certificate method of entrance, which has had a most deplorable effect on the quality of secondary schools all over the country, and has distinctly lowered the quality of the entering classes of the American universities in general. (3) You recommend that a youth whose education is to be prolonged learn but one foreign language up to his nineteenth year. This doctrine flies in the face of all experience concerning the right age to learn the elements of foreign languages. The policy is right for children whose education is to stop at eighteen, or earlier; but it is utterly wrong for those whose education is to be prolonged. (4) You seem to sanction in your first paragraph the absurd antithesis between "preparation for life" and "preparation for college." "Preparation for life" in this sense means only that imperfect preparation which those can receive who must begin to earn money at eighteen years of age, or earlier. "Preparation for college" means preparation for a training subsequent to eighteen years of age, which may last from three to seven years. College education, in short, is much more truly and effectively preparation for life than any other form of education.

I agree with you that the changes you advocate amount to a "re-organization of secondary education"; but the essence of the re-organization, in my opinion, will be differentiation among high schools and greater range of selection among studies for pupils.

**FREDERICK W. HAMILTON, D.D., President Tufts College.**

I doubt if any serious consideration can be given to your statement until next fall, owing to the pressure of matters incident upon the closing of the college year. Personally, I believe that a closer articulation between the high school and college is desirable, and I am personally much more in sympathy than are most of my colleagues on the Faculty with the specific changes you desire to make. I am by no means certain, however, that it is wise to attempt to lay out a high school course in such a way that it may hit any mark which

the shooter may make up his mind he would like to bring down after the projectile has left the gun. While I believe in a good deal of latitude in college entrance requirements and in the acceptance of well taught subjects of almost any kind for admission to college, it does seem to me quite clear that the aim of the high school education ought to be fairly well determined upon at an early period of the course.

It does seem to me that a boy who intends to be a bookkeeper immediately on graduation from the high school, may properly direct his high school course rather differently from a boy who intends to be a clergyman, or a lawyer, or an electrical engineer. In a word, I find myself agreeing with your definite conclusions much more fully than with your premises.

**HARRY A. GARFIELD, LL.D., President Williams College.**

I enclose herewith a letter from the Dean of our Faculty whose position as Chairman of our Committee on Admissions, and also as a member of the College Entrance Examination Board, gives his judgment especial weight. I am in accord with his opinion. So far from abandoning the work in language, I should much prefer that students entering college were through with the beginners' work in Latin and both modern languages, or with Latin and Greek and one modern language, but I realize that, at the present time, it would appear to put upon the schools too great a burden to have accomplished so much.

**FREDERICK C. FERRY, Sc. D., Dean Williams College.**

It seems to me that "preparation for college" and "preparation for life" are not necessarily separate and incompatible. I am not at all clear that the boy or girl who is to go no further than the high school seriously needs "for life" courses in drawing, advanced chemistry, stenography and typewriting, rather than Latin and Greek. It is my own belief that the list of subjects which we prescribe for admission to college are at least equal in their preparation for life to the more modern and vocational course which the high school people propose.

Manifestly Williams College cannot undertake to carry all possible subjects, and it should undertake to continue, it seems to me, through the Freshman year the courses which have been taken during the latter years in the high school. If, then, Williams College were to accept any and every graduate from the high schools of New York City, it would have to be equipped with a sufficient teaching staff to give, in the Freshman year, a far wider range of subjects than is at present possible. Plainly, a college like this is warranted in saying to the New York City high schools that, since we offer only the degree in Arts, we will receive here those boys who have completed the classical course in the high school. Those who have completed a science

course of the old-fashioned sort can go to institutions where the degree of Bachelor of Science is offered. Others may perhaps go to the business college, or to the schools of finance. It does not seem to me that any particular small college should be asked to receive students presenting so great a variety of lines of preparation.

The argument that only one foreign language should be carried in the high school course seems to me particularly weak. Those are much better days for doing work in foreign languages than the college days, and the educated man of the present time must have studied more than a single foreign language, unless education is to be interpreted in a light far different from that of the present-day college. It seems to me that a program would be of greater value which should confine the boys, who are going to classical colleges, entirely to English, Greek, Latin, History, Mathematics, and French or German, rather than to include any of the long list of subjects presented on the sheet from the High School Teachers Association. Household science, art, shop work, commercial branches, elementary bookkeeping, advanced bookkeeping, etc., etc., seem to me to have no appropriate place in a scheme of education leading to the degree of Bachelor of Arts. They should be required of none of the students, I think, who are going to college, and the time necessary for a thorough grounding in three foreign languages and mathematics should be free from trespass on the part of such subjects.

**KENYON L. BUTTERFIELD, President Massachusetts Agricultural College, Amherst.**

I have referred your printed circular concerning the articulation of high school and college to Professor William R. Hart, our Professor of Agricultural Education, and a member of our Committee on Instruction, and am asking him to have the matter brought up for discussion and eventually report to you.

My personal view is that in a college like this, supported at State expense, we ought to articulate very intimately with all the high schools of the State. As a matter of fact, our present entrance requirements enable us to do this fairly well. We do not try to dictate to the high schools in Massachusetts—indeed, we cannot.

I find myself inclined to sympathize with those who hold that the four-year high school course, passed with credit, is sufficient entrance for college. I see two or three practical difficulties, however. One is that many of the new subjects are not at present the equivalent of some of the older subjects in educational value, simply because they are not so well organized nor so well taught. Again, in a course like ours, which is made up of required subjects during the first two years, and which leads to vocational work in the last two years, there might



be some difficulty in arranging work for men, some of whom enter with one subject up and others deficient in it.

For instance, we require that our Freshmen shall have had a year of chemistry. It isn't going to be easy to handle a group of men, some of whom have had perhaps two years of chemistry, some one year, and some none. This difficulty is not found in the university with a wide-open elective system.

**DAVID SNEDDEN, State Commissioner of Education.**

It gives me great pleasure to learn that so large a high school system as that of New York promises to take concerted action in this matter. The present situation is most objectionable, and especially in the restrictive effects it is having on true high school development. I trust that in the near future the Massachusetts high schools will develop concerted action with regard to admission requirements and that the high schools themselves will in the future insist on saying what they can accomplish in four years of genuine work, leaving the colleges free to accept or reject their recommendations.

Of course my acquaintance with Western institutions makes me favor in general an accrediting system whereby the school as a whole, rather than its teaching particular lines of work, should be made a basis of its power to grant recommendations for entrance to college. The time may not yet be ripe for the developing of an accrediting system here, but I think it is much more possible than many critics assume.

**WILLIAM ORR, Deputy State Commissioner of Public Instruction.**

The results of my experience and observation warrant me in giving hearty endorsement to the propositions you make as to the nature and scope, aim and purpose of high school work. It is a hopeful sign that high school teachers are asserting themselves and insisting that the high school itself should regulate and determine its courses and methods of instruction. When the public secondary school teachers of the country take the same stand that the high school teachers of New York have taken in this matter, the vexing question of the relation of the high school to the college will be summarily settled and no such question will exist.

**STRATTON D. BROOKS, City Superintendent, Boston,**

The proposed requirements for admission to college as outlined in the circular sent me inclosed with your letter of May 28, are prac-

tically identical with the requirements as they have been in operation in the University of Illinois for several years. While I was high school inspector for that University, I had occasion to know that these requirements worked very satisfactorily, both from the point of view of the high schools and from the point of view of the University. I have no doubt that even New England may in time see the reasonableness of your request.

**SHERBURN C. HUTCHINSON, City Superintendent, Andover.**

I am in full sympathy with your statement. I believe that the tendency is in the direction indicated and I hope to see the movement hastened.

**WILBUR F. GORDY, City Superintendent, Springfield.**

I have read with the keenest interest the statements of your association. I heartily endorse the point of view taken by your committee. I believe you are right in calling for what, as you say, is practically a re-organization of secondary education. The time has come when the colleges must modify their entrance requirements in the interests of a saner and broader preparation for life.

**FREDERIC ALLISON TUPPER, Head Master Brighton High School, Brighton, Boston.**

1. I believe that every course in the high school should be given a value for admission to college.

2. I believe that the *quality* of the work done should have great weight.

3. I believe that *fewer* subjects *better* prepared would be advantageous to college, school, and all concerned.

**ALBERT PERRY WALKER, Headmaster, Girls High School, Boston.**

I have been much interested in your circular on articulation in high school and college, and the reorganization of secondary education. In general, I agree with the statements therein made.

In reply to your question, "What would be the objections to the acceptance by colleges of high school graduates," I would say that I believe that principle should be applied only to high schools approved by the colleges after special investigation, according to a system such as prevails among the New England colleges and high schools.

I believe in the reduction of the *number* of required subjects. I do not believe in the recognizing of "Standard Subjects" for admission

to college. I believe that college requirements should be confined to subjects necessary to the pursuance of an advanced education. For that reason, I do not believe that such subjects as household science or stenography and typewriting should be recognized for college admission. What I do believe is that the essential subjects should alone be required, and the college requirements should be so limited as to demand only one-half or two-thirds of the pupil's high school time, leaving him free to spend the rest of the time on any subject he chooses, whether it be stenography or household science or music.

I feel especially strongly that it is undesirable to require more than one foreign language because, in my judgment, the thoroughgoing, continuous, intensive study of a single language for four years bears much more fruit than the distribution of the pupil's time among several languages.

**CHARLES I. RICE, Director of Music, Worcester, Mass.**

**and President of the Music Section of the N. E. A.**

The statement of the case is admirable and to the point. The music end of it has received a good deal of attention during the past five years in the annual meetings of the Eastern Educational Conference, which are held in the different colleges, and it is encouraging that your High School Teachers' Association is so fully interested. I am glad you mention Clark College. President Sanford made a masterly plea in his inaugural address for this liberal attitude, and unless I am much mistaken most of the distinguished body of college presidents who attended the inaugural ceremonies envied him his freedom from the trammels of cut-and-dried traditions.

## MICHIGAN

**DAVID MACKENZIE, Principal Detroit Central High School,**

**and President Secondary Department of the N. E. A.**

I am most heartily in favor of the movement toward the complete freedom of the High School. I shall be greatly interested in any action the Secondary Department may take in the matter of freeing the High School from college denomination.

## MINNESOTA

**CYRUS NORTHROP, LL.D., President University of Minnesota.**

I received a few days ago your communication, and I have read it with interest and with substantial agreement with the views therein expressed. As showing the attitude of the University of Minnesota,

I will say that of the subjects which you enumerate as desirable to be recognized by college entrance credits, Minnesota accepts without question, Botany, Zoölogy, Physiography, Modern History, Civics, Economics, and Commercial Geography. Minnesota also accepts the following when the subjects named are part of a definite four year course of study:

Mechanical and Free Hand Drawing.  
Carpentry, Pattern, Forging, Machine Shop Practice.  
Commercial Law.  
Stenography and Typewriting.  
Elementary Bookkeeping.  
Advanced Bookkeeping and Accounting.  
Household Science and Art.

Not accepted: Music.

"Applied Physics, Advanced Chemistry, and Household Chemistry" are not specifically named, but they are practically accepted under Household Science and Art, etc.

## MISSOURI

**HOWARD A. GASS, State Superintendent of Education.**

We have already made considerable progress along the lines you suggest in your letter. Nearly all of the first class western colleges accept work in manual training and domestic science, mechanical drawing, agriculture, etc. Some of them accept work in music and bookkeeping. I am very strongly in favor of the movement toward rationalizing courses of study for colleges and secondary schools.

**JAMES M. GREENWOOD, City Superintendent, Kansas City.**

I am heartily in sympathy with the movement to limit and to rationalize college entrance requirements, and to give notice that the high-school teachers, except for those pupils who expect to enter college or university, shall not be dominated by the scrappy bits of subjects which college committees formulate. The high schools exist for and within themselves, and not as fattening pens to prepare for college or university enrollment. The effect on the teaching in high schools is to narrow and restrict the work, because everything is cut and dried as requirements demand it shall be done, without regard to the needs of the vast majority who will never go to college. The motto of the high schools should be to fit for life first, and for college incidentally.

## NEBRASKA

**SAMUEL AVERY, Ph.D., Chancellor University of Nebraska.**

Having received my education in the West and in Germany, it strikes me at first reading as incredible that there should be serious opposition to any of the suggestions which you make. In fact, it seems to me that the statement is one of the most comprehensive, sane, and practical reports on the subject that I have ever seen. I can most heartily endorse it practically in toto.

**E. C. BISHOP, State Superintendent of Public Instruction.**

I heartily approve the ideas set forth in your statement. You are on the right road to an adjustment which will mean much for better results in high school training and also for the encouragement of more high school graduates to continue their education. The University of Nebraska has already taken an advanced step in accreditation of all work well done in high schools, which I believe will better conditions to a great extent.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

**E. W. BUTTERFIELD, Principal Dover High School.**

I agree thoroughly with your statements and believe that all standard high school subjects should be credited by the colleges. In particular, stenography, typewriting, and bookkeeping are with us so thoroughly established that they are in all ways an equivalent of subjects now recognized by the colleges.

In New Hampshire advanced American history and civics is a required study for all pupils of the senior year. It is a thorough course with daily recitations. We are very anxious that this should receive good college credit, and it has been so accepted by most of the colleges of our region. Smith, Wellesley, and Mt. Holyoke, however, refuse to accept it as yet as elementary. If we can in any way work with you in accomplishing the purpose of your resolutions you may look for our co-operation.

## NEW JERSEY

**ALEXANDER C. HUMPHREYS, LL.D., President Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken.**

We have no right to map out the general scheme of education with the college as the goal. In this connection, in spite of the fact that

the high schools are presumably preparing for college, we find many graduates from high schools who are not able to meet our requirements, even in the *fundamental* studies. Personally, I would prefer, *if it were necessary to make a choice*, that an applicant for admission should come to us thoroughly grounded in the fundamentals even if this involved weakness in other subjects.

**J. M. GREEN, Principal New Jersey State Normal and Model Schools  
and President of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory  
Schools of the Middle States and Maryland.**

I am in full accord with your movement to bring about better articulation of the high school and the college.

The natural educational condition is to have the student go from the high school course best adapted to him directly to a college in which the course is arranged with reference to the work he has already taken up, and there should be the closest and most cordial meeting between the high school and the college in order to accomplish this end.

I do not feel that the High School Teachers Associations are taking all conditions fully into account in their present mode of procedure. There are a number of colleges that are quite willing to comply with their conditions. It seems to me that the high schools should accept the proffer of these colleges and advise their pupils to go to them rather than hold off in an effort to bring all colleges to do what some can do.

My own contact with the colleges has convinced me that each private college has its own particular problems to work out, problems involving its sources of financial support, etc., and that very many of the colleges are not at liberty to do exactly what they might regard as educationally the best.

I do not think the ready admission of high school graduates to the college courses worth while unless the colleges standardize and not receive students who do not come up to standard.

A thorough knowledge of the conditions of the colleges will reveal the fact that there are many of them that are not at liberty to standardize on their entrance conditions. This being the case it is fruitless for the time being to use an effort to have such colleges receive students from high schools who have covered a given course in which the commercial branches or any other branches other than those directly preparatory to college have played a part and are claiming recognition simply as educational values.

It seems to me that the high school people ask that the colleges do something for them, and that when some college comes forward and says it will do it the high school people turn and say, "We will not

accept your gift unless every one else comes to our conditions and does the same thing, no matter what local problems are in the way." This certainly is a great deal to expect, especially where the college is supported by private enterprise and is giving the student more than he pays for.

Furthermore, it is true that the high schools feel the force of popular influence in their courses of study, but it is not always true that this popular influence should be accepted without modification. I recall very well when the popular influence was entirely against the study of foreign languages, the slogan being "Know your own language first." What would have been the result had the colleges yielded to this popular demand?

There is much in the popular curriculum that is very valuable; there is that in it which is decidedly ephemeral, if we are to judge by the most reliable standards of education.

**CHARLES J. BAXTER, State Superintendent Public Instruction.**

This Department is heartily in sympathy with the work you are trying to do in regard to the regulation of high school requirements by colleges and will be glad to assist your organization in any way in our power.

**RANDALL SPAULDING, City Superintendent, Montclair.**

The above statement, and its main conclusions, command my hearty approval; also the approval of the Principal of the high school, Mr. H. W. Dutch, and the Vice-principal, Miss Elsie M. Dwyer.

**VERNON L. DAVEY, Superintendent, East Orange.**

In reply, I would say that I am heartily in sympathy with any movement which will tend to a wise modification of the entrance requirements of the colleges.

While I am not certain that I should endorse the definite list of subjects and units named on page 3 of your circular, I am strongly of the opinion that credit should be given for almost any well planned and properly handled high school subject. I am also of the opinion that the college requirement of three languages besides English is unwise and unprofitable and should be modified.

## NEW MEXICO

**JAMES E. CLARK, Territorial Superintendent Public Instruction.**

Allow me to say that I sympathize entirely with the movement for reorganization of secondary education, and I believe that you will find upon examination of the catalogue of the University of New Mexico,

that the entrance requirements are practically such as you would like to see excepting in the matter of placing on the elective list the subject of music. Great care is taken in admitting students offering some of the other subjects, but I believe it will be found that whenever subjects are found to have been well taught under capable instructors, credit is given also for such subjects towards admission.

## NEW YORK

### **GEORGE P. BRISTOL, Chairman Committee on Relations to Secondary Schools, Cornell University.**

I hope that we may be able, working together, to make more progress in the direction in which you are working. I assure you of my personal sympathy with the movement your committee represents.

### **ADAM LEROY JONES, Chairman Committee on Undergraduate Admissions, Columbia University.**

As you are aware, we allow a wide range of choice among subjects to those who are candidates for admission to Columbia College. We should not be ready to accept all of the suggestions which your committee has made but we do regard them as valuable and we sincerely hope that the relations between the college and the secondary school will be such as to serve the best interests of both.

### **JAMES M. TAYLOR, LL.D., President Vassar College.**

I regard this matter as of prime importance, and I shall ask the attention of the Faculty to it.

### **CHARLES H. LEVERMORE, Ph.D., President Adelphi College, Brooklyn.**

It will not be possible for our Faculty to give serious consideration to the propositions contained in your circular before some time next fall. I believe that the formal action of the Faculty upon your suggestions is likely to be favorable. The regulations which you desire concerning entrance requirements in languages have been in force in this College ever since it was chartered. I am personally in favor of allowing credit for all subjects specified on the last page of your circular, and I only regret that you and your associates did not propose a radical change in the present system of entrance requirements in English.

### **CHARLES P. NORTON, Chancellor University of Buffalo.**

We are trying to get our collegiate department for the University of Buffalo, and hope to do so in the near future. In the meantime,



I may say that I heartily agree with the views expressed in your circular letter.

**REV. E. L. CAREY, C.M., President St. Johns College, Brooklyn.**

You will find that we credit for entrance many of the subjects mentioned in your statement. We would be quite willing to give reasonable credit for the remaining subjects, provided they were classed as electives.

Without presuming to pronounce on the question of fact involved, may I venture to say that I do not admit a distinction between "preparation for college" and "preparation for life." Rational preparation for college is preparation for life. At best, however, preparation for college is an incomplete, and from a certain view point, an inadequate preparation for life.

I hope the day will never come when one class of students will be prepared "for college," and another "for life." Prepare them *all* in a rational way for life and those who are fit will be adequately prepared for college.

**RUSH RHEES, President Rochester University.**

First, I am entirely convinced that college entrance requirements should be defined by the colleges in conjunction with the representatives of the secondary school and on the basis of a frank recognition of the proper function of the secondary schools.

Secondly, I do not believe that the colleges can fulfill their mission in our educational system if the secondary schools adopt it as their aim to be exclusively finishing schools without regard to the purpose of the students to follow education further in a higher institution. Nor do I believe that the secondary schools will fulfill their proper function as tax supported institutions unless they clearly recognize as definite relation to the institutions above them as they do to the schools below them. The situation in Germany is distinctly to the point, for there gymnasium, real-gymnasium and ober-real-schule are definitely organized with a view to the preparation of students for work in universities. It may readily be regarded as unwise for our secondary schools to follow this German example, but I am convinced that it would be still more unwise for them to ignore the fact that secondary education holds a vital relation in subject matter as well as in extent to higher education.

Thirdly, I do not believe that it would be advantageous in the interests of our national education to confine the student's linguistic study in our public high schools to one foreign language pursued for four years. The high school period is the natural time for the ac-

quisition of languages and if students are to become acquainted with more than one foreign language as educated men and women it is important that they should begin that work at least as early as the high school period.

Fourthly, many of the subjects mentioned by you as suitable to be recognized by the college for entrance credits have little or no significance, from the point of view of the college, as a preparatory training. Many of them, however, have such significance, particularly for certain courses in college. I believe that the college should have an open mind with reference to every development of interest in the high schools and should be as liberal as possible in the extension of entrance credit to high school subjects. It is increasingly clear to me, however, that preparation for college, whatever may be said concerning the preparation for life, can not properly be measured quantitatively. Four years spent upon a very great variety of different subjects, each studied for one year or possibly less, do not have at all the same educational value from the point of view of preparation for later work that is furnished by the same length of time devoted to a smaller number of subjects each pursued for two or three or four years. The same consideration is true and is coming to be more and more clearly recognized of college education. Three years spent upon one subject, whether science or literature or history, is of vastly more value for education than three years spent upon three different subjects.

The college might reasonably reduce its specific prescriptions for preparatory training, and leave a margin for the secondary schools to fill as they deem best. I think the college should demand a completed secondary school course, *including* for any given college course what the college regards as an irreducible minimum of specific preparation for that course. But that is far from your proposal.

**EDWARD E. HALE, JR., Secretary Education Committee,  
Union College.**

The committee considered the matter carefully, and with the full appreciation of many of the difficulties which the association feels in the correct articulation of school and college work. The committee did not feel, however, that it could consider definitely the question of admitting without examinations the graduates of the New York City high schools. Such a consideration would be largely theoretical, for few of our students come from New York City.

The committee also found it impossible to agree with the views of the association in the matter of election or option at entrance. Although our entrance requirements recognize a certain amount of

election in several of the courses, the committee felt itself quite unready for any statement of opinion upon the general question as outlined in your letter.

**ANDREW S. DRAPER, LL.D., State Commissioner of Education.**

The subject is one, as we all know, with endless ramifications, about which a great deal has been said, and more will be said, and I cannot therefore undertake in this connection to discuss details. I may say, however, that I have read your printed circular carefully, and in a general way I feel strongly sympathetic with the views of your committee. I think the colleges are too exacting in their requirements for admission, and particularly that they lay too much stress upon knowledge of what is in books and too little upon the power to do things. Moreover, I think that the colleges should receive the graduates of recognized high schools and give them their opportunity to show whether or not they can do college work.

**FRANK ROLLINS, Ph.D., Second Assistant Commissioner of Education.**

I am in sympathy with the general recommendations of the report of your committee, and I can see no reason why the colleges should not agree to accept for admission worthily accomplished work along any of the lines suggested in your report, provided, of course, that the colleges should still insist upon thorough and adequate preparation in certain subjects that are fundamental to the successful pursuit of college work. Among these subjects, which would stand in the nature of absolute requirements, I should include English, elementary algebra, plane geometry, American history and civics, a foreign language, and at least one unit in science. With these as a foundation the colleges may well afford to permit a very wide range of electives in making up the rest of the entrance requirements.

**ARTHUR D. DEAN, Chief, Division of Trades Schools, New York State Education Department.**

I am primarily interested in the development of trades schools or courses. These have absolutely no reference to the college entrance requirements. I advocate separate industrial or trades schools, or at least separate and distinct courses within existing high schools. Industrial education is a system of education which is to be apart from any dominations of colleges. It should mean more than the introduction of shopwork or drawing in the existing high schools. There is a bigger question involved, that of the correlation of mathematics, English and history with industrial and commercial activities. Of course all pupils of industrial schools or courses should have mathematics, history and English, but the subject-matter should be of a different order. The mathematics of a milling machine has

greater disciplinary value to a boy that is using a milling machine in a school shop than has the present mathematics when it is unrelated to the manual training that the boy may be taking. The same may be said of science work. Note the development of Chemistry in the daily life of our people—the chemistry of soils, the kitchen, the shop, and compare the educational possibilities of such chemistry with the “alchemy” that we teach today.

Personally I do not care where they put this industrial education. It may be in the high school, in a separate school or in a factory. The only point that needs consideration is so to work out the scheme that it will reach the pupils that need it and benefit them. I am simply interested in having boys and girls kept in school, given what they need, fitted for their work and sent into the world as more efficient men and women.

If the colleges will not give way to the needs of the high school situation, then let us have two courses in our high schools—one based on college requirements and the other based upon the requirements of industrial and commercial life, and once established, the latter course will have a healthy reaction upon the older course.

**WILLIAM H. MAXWELL, LL.D., City Superintendent, New York City.**

I endorse this statement issued by the High School Teachers Association, and I congratulate your association on the position it has taken. I say this, however, without prejudice to my right to change my opinion on the details of your plan, should I see fit to do so on more mature consideration.

I regret that your Association did not see fit to ask for a reduction in the number of texts to be read in Latin and in English for admission to college.

**ARTHUR S. SOMERS, Member of the High School Committee of the Board of Education, New York City.**

I have your letter of the 19th instant and note with very great interest the effort that your association is making to have the requirements for college entrance modified and placed upon a more reasonable basis.

I am sure that this effort must win the applause of everyone interested in the matter of college education. Of course, I have not had a great deal of experience in such matters, not being a college man, but I cannot lose sight of the fact that the feeling is growing among business men generally, that the colleges are not making the most of their opportunity to fit men for active participation in the affairs of life, and this, I believe, is due largely to the restrictions with which the entrance is surrounded. It does seem to me that if a

proper and more democratic view were taken of the equipment necessary for college entrance, it would result in a brighter and more generally useful man at the end of his college course.

This is not the time to follow the lead of such a discussion, but I cannot refrain from this brief expression as my reason for being largely in favor of the effort of your organization. No criticism of the college is intended. On the contrary, I would that every young man, as far as possible, might have the advantage of college training of the right sort; but, unfortunately, I find in my experience many college men who are seriously handicapped because they have been educated over the heads of the actual necessities of life.

**CHARLES F. HARPER, Principal Syracuse Central High School,  
New York.**

Superintendent Blodgett has asked me to answer your letter to him when I answer the one you wrote me. I have carefully considered the statement of your "Committee on Conference with the Colleges" and find that I agree heartily with it for the most part. I believe that classes in a subject should be taught the same subject matter whether they are preparing for college or for life. No one can tell in advance what a pupil will do after graduation.

Clark College has surely set a splendid example to the other colleges in the matter of admission requirements. Any pupil who has completed a carefully outlined course of study in a high grade high school should find no difficulty in entering any college. A reduction of the so-called required subjects, with greater freedom in the choice of electives that could be offered, together with the recognition of any subjects that are definite and well-taught in high schools, would remove the difficulties which are found at the present time. I question whether some subjects such as typewriting should be included in the list for recognition.

There seems to be a general tendency on the part of all the best colleges to meet the demands of the high school for modified entrance requirements whenever they appear just. I believe that your recommendations will be gladly received by the colleges and recognized by greater freedom in the elective subjects which may be offered in the future.

**HENRY H. DENHAM, Principal Syracuse Technical High School.**

So far as I have had time to consider the matter I most heartily indorse your statement.

**CHARLES R. RICHARDS, Director, Cooper Union.**

While I do not feel that manual training in general high school courses is an element of serious importance, I think that a movement towards a broader system of accrediting high school work on the part of the colleges is in the right direction. It seems to me, however, that this is a matter that has its limitations, and that in the future development of specialized vocational high schools, special types of secondary schools will limit their aims as far as higher schools are concerned to preparation for special types of professional schools of college grade.

**ERNEST R. von NARDROFF, Principal Stuyvesant High School,  
New York City.**

I believe that the move made by the High School Teachers Association toward the articulation of the high school and college is a great step in the right direction. I should like, however, to see in the list of subjects to be recognized by college entrance credits mechanical drawing represented by from one-half to two units, and, in place of "applied Physics" I should prefer the more general expression of "advanced physics" to correspond to "advanced chemistry."

**WILLIAM L. FELTER, Ph. D., Principal Girls High School, Brooklyn.**

I congratulate your committee on the excellent scheme which it has proposed. Your difficulty has been to adjust conditions which grow out of the former one type high school. So long as pupils are pursuing the academic course the present requirements for admission to colleges can easily be met. But with the differentiation of high schools, with the introduction of the manual training, technical and commercial schools, the pupils attending these new types of high schools are placed at a decided disadvantage. If pupils knew when they entered high school what their after life was to be, plans might be made accordingly, but in nearly every case neither the pupil nor the parent is able to decide. The high school course is the season for testing, for developing latent powers, for deciding what the future career is to be. Even in the academic schools pupils do not decide as to a college career until within a fortnight of the date of graduation. With the present rigid college entrance requirements, if a pupil has made a misstep anywhere along the line of his high school work, this step may have fatal results.

While Latin has always been the supreme test of the high school pupil's ability, any educator of any standing would deem that other subjects might have equally great value in determining the test. Native genius and capability should be elements entering into the fitting

of a pupil for college rather than the time element. For illustration, a bright pupil is able to prepare for college in three and one-half years, and in my own experience, with but three years of high school training has won university scholarships.

The work done in good commercial and technical schools demands recognition from colleges. Then, too, the importance placed upon history, especially with reference to the making of history from day to day, is worthy of serious consideration.

If the plan adopted by you is accepted, and I earnestly trust it will be, by the colleges, high schools of all types will stand upon exactly the same footing. It will remain for the pupils in the newer types of schools to demonstrate to the college authorities that the training given in their subjects has as much educational value as the old line of academic training. I believe your plan is worthy of endorsement and of a protracted trial at the hands of the college authorities.

## NORTH CAROLINA

**JAMES Y. JOYNER, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and  
President of the National Education Association.**

The Articulation of High School and College would have been an excellent topic for discussion, either on the general program or on one of the departmental programs, and I wish you had suggested it to me before the completion of the general program. I regard it as an exceedingly important subject, and I agree, in the main, with the views expressed in the excellent statement of your committee.

## NORTH DAKOTA

**RICHARD HAYWARD, State High School Inspector.**

Your letter to State Superintendent, W. L. Stockwell, has been handed to me for reply. In general, I heartily approve of the ideas set forth by your Association. I believe that almost any high school pupil can well afford to spend sufficient time to do two or three units of foreign language before graduating; but except for the few more time than that is misspent. All high school graduates should have done besides some foreign language in most cases, some work in mathematics, history and civics, science, and at least three units in English. He should also have given  $\frac{1}{8}$  to  $\frac{1}{3}$  of his time in high school to music and drawing, and manual training, domestic science, commercial or agricultural subjects. In my opinion such work, well done, should be accepted for entrance to college.

I do not agree that a college should accept *any* high school graduate; because that would probably mean that the college would have to dismiss some of them after a short trial and that would not be fair to the high school graduate. Again, in my opinion a high school pupil's work should be over half academic,—there is a chance of going too far with vocational training in high school.

## OHIO

**CHARLES S. HOWE, Ph.D., President Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland.**

This is a technical school and hence its requirements are quite different from those of the ordinary college. We accept drawing—both mechanical and free hand,—joinery, pattern making, forging, and machine shop practice, for admission. We also allow botany, zoology, physiography, advanced physics, advanced chemistry, modern history, civics, and economics to be presented for admission up to four units. We have not yet felt that we could accept commercial subjects.

There is one objection to a technical school's accepting whatever subjects the student brings from the high school, because our students must go on with higher mathematics, with English, with drawing and descriptive geometry, and with modern languages. If part of the students came with one preparation in each of these subjects, and part with some other preparation, there would be no starting point for any of them; or rather there would be several starting points for our college work, and it would be exceedingly difficult to properly classify the freshmen.

In reply to a subsequent inquiry, President Howe writes:

I cannot give you information in regard to the effect of drawing and shop work upon our students because we have never made a list of these men nor a comparison between them and others. I am perfectly satisfied in my own mind that manual training work when carried on in the right way is helpful in the mental as well as in the manual development of students.

We have always been willing to accept commercial law and I believe economics for admission. These would come under elective subjects. Commercial geography has never come before us for discussion. I presume that if a student should offer it and should also offer the other subjects which we absolutely require, there would be no hesitation in giving him full credit for it.

**ALSTON ELLIS, LL.D., President Ohio University, Athens.**

My opinion is that the colleges and universities of the country will have to make their entrance requirements more flexible to conditions



that now exist in the secondary schools. The old-time requirements were good in their day but they have outlived the time when they can be applied with satisfactory results. I do not feel that we have rounded out a perfect plan at Ohio University, but we surely have devised one that will meet modern conditions better than any that I know to be in operation in other higher institutions of learning.

**GEORGE M. JONES, Secretary Oberlin College, Oberlin.**

I am very much interested in the work of your committee. It seems to me that the graduates of good high schools ought to be able to secure admission to college whether they have taken the regular "college preparatory" course or not, and I expect that the example of Clark College will be followed by many other colleges. Oberlin has a minimum language requirement of four units. These can be presented in Latin or a combination of Latin and a second language. We specify a minimum of two units in Latin and have not yet reached the point where we are willing to release this requirement for our A.B. degree. Perhaps the time has come for this change, and I shall take pleasure in presenting your circular to our Committee on Admission to see whether the committee will be willing to allow four years of French or German to meet the language requirement without any Latin. We have no B.S. course and there is no discrimination against Latin.

**WILLIAM E. SMYSER, Registrar, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware.**

This institution (Ohio Wesleyan University) has for a number of years observed the recommendations of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools with regard to the acceptance of certificates from approved High Schools. High School subjects are accepted to the total of fifteen units in assigning the candidate to Freshmen classification. In case the candidate has not completed certain subjects prescribed for admission, he makes up his deficiency in the sub-Freshman studies with the classes of the academic department, so that a very satisfactory articulation between the work of the college and the secondary school has been effected. Our experience has been that the plan works well, and I believe that this is the general experience of the other colleges of Ohio which are co-operating in the same way.

**W. W. BOYD, Dean, College of Education, Ohio State University,  
Columbus.**

Your statement addressed to Dr. Thompson, the President of our University, has been referred to me for reply.

In the beginning, permit me to express an appreciation of the

effort you are making for a closer articulation between high schools and colleges. The high school does not exist for the purpose of preparing a few persons for the acquirement of a monopoly in education. It exists to make ordinary knowledge more universal. But, as long as it leaves the student after a full course with the rudiments only of knowledge, it should leave him in that condition wherein he can get more knowledge. However, it does not seem to be the business of the college to take a student at any station of educational attainment and by adding four years of work graduate him with a degree. If the college is to arrive at a given point at a fixed rate of speed, it must establish a starting place. This is what causes the high school to feel the burden of college entrance requirements. These requirements may be fixed, arbitrary and in some cases unreasonable. But very much more of the reputation, if not the character, of an educational institution is determined by its starting place than by its stopping place. As colleges have different ideals, they will naturally establish different starting places.

As I am not familiar either with the entrance requirements of Clark College or with the curricula of the New York high schools, I am unable to say whether it would be considered wise for our authorities here to follow the lead of Clark College in admitting students from the New York high schools.

A student may enter our College of Arts as a candidate for the A.B. degree with no Latin or Greek. He will be required to offer four units of foreign language which may be Latin, Greek, German, French or Spanish. Some credit is given for physiography, zoölogy, botany, physiology, agriculture, free hand drawing, manual training and domestic science.

The necessity for a divergence in high school courses for "preparation for life" and "preparation for college," which your circular indicates, does not seem to be well established. A better articulation of both institutions may lead to better results for the high school student who does not intend to go to college as well as for the one who intends to go. It has not been proved that the so-called course of study in "preparation for life" will save the great number of boys and girls who are said to be sacrificed by the course of study in "preparation for college." Some pupils have an aversion to work of any kind. I feel that any course of study which does not involve plenty of real work will be a failure. It is true that an interest in some studies may stimulate work. The larger truth is that some teachers have an ability to stimulate zealous effort with any study. In the high school as elsewhere the teacher is the greatest factor.

I have no doubt the service of your committee will be a great aid

to our colleges and universities in the solution of the vexed question.

If we can be of further assistance to you in any way, we will be glad to know it.

**WILLIAM H. ELSON, City Superintendent, Cleveland.**

I am much pleased at the statement issued by your organization. I approve most heartily of the movement toward more liberal interpretation of college entrance requirements.

## PENNSYLVANIA

**ISAAC SHARPLESS, LL.D., President Haverford College, Haverford.**

I should be very glad to co-operate with any movement which would increase the ability of the high schools to give the courses of study they think is best for them, and at the same time send their students to college. We have gone some distance in Haverford College in this direction. I do not feel sure, however, that it will be right for us to adopt the whole of your list of subjects even for elective subjects, but your circular will cause us to consider very carefully whether we can add something to our present list; nor does it seem to me to be wise for us to reduce the requirements of admission from two languages to one. *Any* two foreign languages will now admit to our college.

**GEORGE EDWARD REED, S. T. D., LL. D., President Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.**

The majority of the faculty of Dickinson College are of the opinion that there should be a closer articulation between the high schools of the country and the colleges.

My personal opinion is that students who have completed a four-year course of study in a high school of high and approved rank might justly be entered in any college or university even though the student may have pursued what is known as the commercial course or have taken his course in a technical training school where sufficient emphasis is placed upon purely cultural studies. Most of these studies are mentioned in your circular, especially Music, Modern History, Civics, Economics, Commercial Law, Advanced Bookkeeping and Accounting, etc., and might well be recognized in college entrance credits. Here in Dickinson college we have one course of study called the scientific course, where, under one set of conditions, a student need not present Latin as meeting one of the requirements of admission in said course, but he must be able to present a large amount of work in two modern languages. We have not been giving credit for the

subjects enumerated in your letter, but my judgment is that the time is coming when this will be done.

I hope that out of the discussion which is now going on in the country there may come a closer articulation of the college and the high school and a proper differentiation also, if possible, in the work of the institutions of the kind described.

### **JOSEPH SWAIN, President, Swarthmore College.**

The difficulty you mention has been partially solved at Swarthmore by allowing a wide range of choice of entrance subjects.

### **A. H. ESPENHADE, Registrar Pennsylvania State College.**

*Personally* I am in hearty accord with the ground which your committee takes in its circular letter. For admission to this college we now require three units of English; three of Mathematics (which include Algebra through Quadratics, and Plane and Solid Geometry); two units of history; two units or years of some one language; two units of science and two units of electives. A pretty wide range of different subjects may be chosen for the two elective units; and yet this range of electives is not so wide as that proposed in your recent letter.

### **REV. S. B. McCORMICK, LL.D., Chancellor University of Pittsburgh.**

I submitted to several important members of our Faculty your letter and statement. The expressions of opinion which came are as follows:—they, in general, accord with my own views:

“All admit the waste in education to-day because of the imperfect articulation of the High School and College.

There is a clear question as to whether there is not too much of the ‘practical’ in this suggested solution to this very serious difficulty.

I am not ready to say that this suggested reduction in the present requirements in order that the High School may take in even a greater variety of what this plan wants recognized as standard subjects will bring a better articulation of High School and College.

The whole question of High School ‘electives’ merits the most careful consideration in this connection.”—J. H. White.

“The need of adjustment between High School and College is certainly pressing.

I am not in favor of dropping the requirement of *two* modern languages, except where the group system prevails when the amount of preparation varies.

I would like to see the certificate of all High Schools accepted for entrance, but that state of things depends upon the High Schools them-

selves. With Professor Gibbs, I believe that quality—not *quantity* is wanted.”—G. A. M. Dyess.

“I believe these suggestions are worthy of serious consideration.”  
—R. T. Stewart.

“Colleges may recognize the subjects listed on the last page of the circular, provided the student be allowed to present from this group not more than five of the fifteen units required for entrance.

The reduction of entrance requirements to one foreign language (four units) is to be approved.

Colleges will be more ready to grant credits for industrial subjects than they are at present, after they all see an improvement in the quality of preparation. Merely quantitative standards prevail too exclusively at present.”—L. R. Gibbs.

“I should like to see the certificate of a High School giving a four years’ course accepted for its value as a whole rather than for the exact number of units that might be counted up from it upon the basis of the standards now in force. I agree with Professor Gibbs that we most pressing need quality rather than quantity standards, and I should be very much in favor of letting a pupil who showed his preparation by his performance—in College classes—go on with them whether certain *exact* conditions of admission were fulfilled or not so long as no condition exists that does not break a logical continuity of subject, or prevent progress to higher reaches in it.”—A. E. Frost.

“Surely this movement is timely. There is a lamentable lack of articulation between High School and College,—between the work which the High School *must* do and that which the College *may* do.

For entrance requirements to the School of Economics, I should be glad to have all the subjects mentioned (excepting possibly music and household science and art) recognized by college entrance credits.

I approve the suggestion that only one foreign language be *required* for admission.”—J. T. Holdsworth.

**CHEESMAN A. HERRICK, President Girard College, Philadelphia.**

I am interested in your communication as I have spent nearly twenty years in High School work.

Girard College, however, is neither a college nor a school which fits for College, so that we are not specifically concerned in your communication. I wish you success in the good work you are doing.

**A. DUNCAN YOCUM, Professor of Pedagogy, University of Pennsylvania.**

While I cannot speak for the university I am in hearty sympathy with the general recommendations of your committee. I would cheerfully do anything that I can to further your movement here or elsewhere.

**REED B. TIETRICK, Deputy State Superintendent.**

There is a field for important work in the line of reorganization of secondary education. The first business of the high school is not to "prepare for college." If colleges can accept "preparation for life" as entrance requirements without harming the work of the college, such a scheme would be a decided "step" in the cause of education. It would seem that the subjects which you propose could be recognized as college entrance credits. It is not so much *what* one studies as it is *that he studies* and *how* he studies.

**OLIVER P. CORNMAN, Ph.D., Associate Superintendent,  
Philadelphia.**

Your letter and statement has been referred to me for reply. We are in hearty accord with the most radical suggestions of your statement, and if the recommendation could not be accomplished, we believe that the modifications suggested in lieu thereof to be both feasible and wise. We trust that the work that you have performed upon this problem will have some practical outcome, and that some reform may be accomplished in the not too distant future.

**JAMES J. PALMER, City Superintendent, Oil City.**

I am very much pleased that your organization has taken up this question, and I assure you that I heartily approve the position the association has taken in this matter. The High School is no longer a special preparatory school for the college, and besides the High School is manned in many cases by just as capable teachers as are those found in the college. There is no doubt that the high school ought to be allowed the freedom that would develop its proper sphere of usefulness in the community.

**EDWARD RYNearson, Director of High Schools, Pittsburgh.**

I am delighted with the spirit of your letter of the 10th inst. and of the enclosures, and am much interested in your movement. High school men everywhere are interested in the work you are planning in New York.

**W. D. LEWIS, Principal William Penn High School for Girls,  
Philadelphia.**

Until the colleges recognize as a unit for entrance any subject essential to the education of any boy or girl, our high schools will be very much handicapped. The problem of the high school to-day is that of adjustment to the needs of young people who are to live their lives in a complicated civilization. The courses must therefore be broad in order to prepare pupils to meet widely differing demands.

Great numbers of these boys and girls do not know whether or not they will go to college until they are well along in the high school course. If the work already done is not accepted for entrance, the doors are closed to many of the most promising students.

It is time for the colleges to abandon the fetish of classicism and recognize themselves as an integral part of the educational machinery of the country.

Principal Lewis sends us the following statements from prominent educators:

*President Jordan.*—H. S. [stands for] well rounded education. "This is all that the colleges have a right to ask, and for them to specify certain classes of subjects, regardless of the real interests of the secondary schools is a species of impertinence which only tradition justifies."

*G. Stanley Hall.*—The domination of the high school by the college is an anacronism, a survival from a very different period in the nation's life.

*Prof. Perrin, Boston University.*—They are the most preposterous requirements for the admission of boys to college. The ones who are to leave school and go to work are the ones who are hurt the most.

*E. J. Goodwin.*—We are gradually coming to recognize the injustice of organizing our high school in the interest of the few alone who are able to command a liberal or semi-liberal education.

*Prof. Samuel Wendell Williston, Chicago University.*—The fact that only twelve per cent. of those who enter high school ever graduate is largely due to the influence of the college.

*C. P. Carey, State Superintendent, Wisconsin Schools.*—Examination for entrance to college means dry-rot in the secondary school \* \* \*

What we ask is that the universities should release their grip on the schools of the state, and give them a chance to develop. They ought to be permitted to develop freely from within and not be forced into the Chinese shoe of college entrance requirements.

*Emperor William in 1890.*—We ought to train up young Germans with a national spirit, not as Greeks or Romans. We must depart from the basis which has been the tradition of centuries, from monastic schools of the middle ages when Latin was the chief thing with a little Greek in addition. I will therefore approve the foundation of no more schools in the future unless their necessity can be proved.

Vocational Fr'y in large cities,

Wm. Orr, Sch. Rev. Jn. '09. 417.

*Superintendent Stratton D. Brooks.*—The demands as to admission should be based upon the unofficial or at least unsystematic judgment

of the principal. By this I mean that no schematic arrangement of percentage or subterfuges or reports should take the place of the real judgment of the principal.

*Prof. G. H. Nettleton, Yale.*—Much good ink is shed yearly in discussion of educational ideals for prep. schools, but so long as the college examiner remains the final judge from whose verdict no effective appeal can be taken, the secondary schools must inevitably conform in large measure to the methods of the particular court before ever the cases of their pupils come to trial.

**JOSEPH G. E. SMEDLEY, Principal Chester High School, Chester.**

I see no good reason why colleges should not make up a list of approved high schools, name certain approved and acceptable courses, and then admit the graduates of such schools and courses on the recommendations of the principals. It imposes a great burden when principals are required to fill out a number of very detailed certificates. It should be easy to withhold the privilege of recommendation from schools abusing the privilege.

**CHARLES S. FOOS, City Superintendent, Reading.**

I concur fully in the statement made by your association. I trust that your scheme will find favor and I believe that its adoption will do away with college domination and make the High Schools of the country what they ought to be, fitting schools not only for those who go to college but for those who do not go to college. I assure you of my earnest co-operation.

**EDWARD S. LING, Superintendent, Lock Haven.**

I have read your statement with interest. It seems to me that the changes therein suggested in college entrance requirements must come soon. We have felt quite keenly the injustice in the non-recognition of certain kinds of work which we feel that we should give our pupils to train them for life. We do not believe that the students should be divided into the two classes. Its results have been unsatisfactory to us. Let us give them the preparation for life and let the colleges recognize this as sufficient preparation for college, when the preparation has been thorough.

We should be glad to see the recommendations of your statement put into practical operation throughout the country.

## RHODE ISLAND

**REV. WILLIAM H. P. FAUNCE, LL.D., President Brown University, Providence.**

I believe that the teachers and principals are right in asking for a closer articulation and a more flexible system of entrance requirements.



The colleges are now moving toward more "required work" after students enter college, this, to be accompanied by less "required work" in preparation for college. That is to say, the college should determine more specifically what students should study after they enter, and the high schools should determine more specifically what they wish their students to study while in the high school. I believe in the reduction of required subjects for admission to college, and one foreign language is enough in the case of many students. I believe there should be no discrimination against Latin for the course leading to the B.S. degree.

I am unable to go as far in this matter, however, as your Teachers' Association. Possibly you forget that while it is quite safe for all the eastern colleges to accept the graduates of any New York High School, yet we have to deal not simply with the high schools of New York City, but with those of small and backward country towns throughout the land. These high schools are usually destitute of laboratories or libraries, and rarely have adequate teaching force. When such a high school sends its pupils who offer shop work or joinery or pattern-making, of course the situation is ludicrous. When such high schools present physiography or zoölogy, there is no way we have of estimating the value or meaning of such a course.

If we are to accept skill in manipulating a typewriter for admission to college, should we not accept skill in using the sewing machine or in operating a trolley-car? I believe there is a good deal more education gained in operating an electric car than in operating a typewriter, but how can we estimate the amount of education thus gained?

I have thus stated a few of the difficulties. Many of the subjects you mention as proper preparation for college cannot be taught in three-fourths of the high schools of this country. But with your main position I am heartily in sympathy, and shall bring the matter at once before my Faculty.

**WALTER E. RANGER, State Commissioner of Public Schools.**

I sincerely commend the purpose of your committee to promote a better articulation of high schools and colleges, and heartily approve its statement regarding the need of a reorganization of secondary education. I have long realized the need of greater freedom of the secondary school in determining courses and subjects, chiefly for the good of its students. Twenty-seven years ago, as principal of a secondary school, I introduced into regular courses commercial law, civics, economics, as well as several scientific and commercial branches. Most boys and girls preparing for college elected the three subjects named. This indicates my attitude toward arts and subjects suggested by needs of students and urged by popular demand.

## VERMONT

**JOHN M. THOMAS, D. D., President Middlebury College.**

I wish to acknowledge your communication of May 19th enclosing the important statement of the High School Teachers' Association of New York City concerning college entrance requirements. I shall refer these documents to our committee on admission. In the meantime may I say that I am heartily in favor of the views expressed by your Committee. I believe the college should join itself to the high school and that the public high school should not be required to adapt itself to the college. The secondary school should have the responsibility of giving to its pupils the education demanded by their environment and suited to their time of life, without embarrassment from other considerations. I should be glad to admit without further requirements the graduates of the high schools of New York City.

Your suggestion that there should be no discrimination against Latin for the course leading to the B.S. degree is excellent, and I think we should not hesitate to allow credit for subjects specified on the last page of your circular.

**MASON S. STONE, State Superintendent of Education.**

In response to yours of the 26th, I hasten to state that in my opinion a public high school, being a public institution and supported by public funds, should not fit for college. The college should fit to the high school. The chief function of the high school is to enable the individual to find out what he can best do and to give him a certain degree of culture and discipline. If the individual is required to fit the school and the school does not fit the individual, the individual becomes crippled, and we are having too many deformities as a result of our restricted and required courses.

**ALBERT W. VARNEY, City Superintendent, Bennington.**

I am most heartily in accord with the position taken by your Association. I believe the fairest and most satisfactory arrangement would be to accept graduates from any four years' high school course, but on certificate of the principal that the individual has the fit and mental power to do college work. It is a question of mental power not of any set of subjects passed. Many graduates from country high schools have not the mental power nor natural ability necessary for college work. You mention Clark, but that college asks for only the best. It does not undertake to give a college education to all who hold a high

school diploma. I think, therefore, that a principal's certificate of fitness is the one requirement in addition to a four years' high school course. If this cannot be obtained as the requirement, then your recommendations would be the next best change. I approve especially of the one foreign language requirement.

Our high school principal, Mr. H. B. Dickinson, also endorses your recommendations.

**A. E. TUTTLE, Principal Bellows Falls High School.**

I approve this idea most heartily, and, in justice to all concerned, the colleges must very soon adopt the plan outlined above.

## WASHINGTON

**EDWARD O. SISSON, Professor of Education, University of Washington.**

I may say that the University of Washington has already made to the high schools practically all the concessions you suggest in the circular.

## **SECONDARY DEPARTMENT**

### **NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION**

**RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED JULY, 1910**

WHEREAS, a wide range of high school subjects is now demanded in view of the varied needs of society and the diversified interests of different students, and

WHEREAS, manual training, commercial branches, music, household science and art, agriculture, etc., when well taught and thoroughly learned are worthy of, and justly entitled to, recognition in college entrance credits, and

WHEREAS, colleges in certain parts of the United States continue to require two foreign languages from every applicant regardless of his dominant interest, and

WHEREAS, this requirement in addition to such work in English, Mathematics, History, and Science as is essential to the high school course of every student precludes the possibility of giving adequate attention to these other subjects, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that it is the sense of the Secondary Department of the National Education Association that the interests of high school students would be advanced by the reduction of the requirement in foreign language to one such language and the recognition as electives of all subjects well taught in the high school, and be it further

RESOLVED, that it is the sense of this Department that until such modification is made by the colleges, the high schools will be greatly hampered in their attempts to serve the best interests of boys and girls in the public high school.

---

## **DEPARTMENT OF MANUAL TRAINING AND ART EDUCATION**

### **NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION**

**RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED JULY, 1910**

WHEREAS, many High Schools in the United States are now giving good courses in Shop Work, Drawing, Household Science and Art, and

WHEREAS, these subjects contribute to the increase of intellectual and imaginative power, to the broadening of social understanding, and

to the usefulness and happiness of the student in ways not afforded by other subjects, and

WHEREAS, the recognition of these subjects by college entrance credits would encourage High Schools in extending and intensifying this work, therefore be it

RESOLVED, by the Manual Training Section of the National Education Association that the colleges be urged to grant recognition to these subjects as electives whenever this work is well taught in any High School.

---

## DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS EDUCATION

### NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

#### RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED JULY 1910

WHEREAS, many college graduates enter business life and nearly every college graduate requires some knowledge of business practice and theory, and

WHEREAS, our high schools are now offering good courses in business and the graduates of business courses in the high school would often be encouraged to enter college if the work already done were recognized by college entrance credits, and

WHEREAS, commercial efficiency would be increased and a right conception of business as a public service would be more readily inculcated in our youth if commercial courses were given the recognition to which they are justly entitled, therefore be it

RESOLVED, by the Business Section of the National Education Association, that colleges be and hereby are urged, in the interests both of our boys and girls, and of higher standards of business efficiency and integrity, to grant college entrance credit to business courses and that the entrance requirements in foreign languages be reduced.





JAN 24 1911

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 725 244 3